

30. (Original) The system of claim 17, wherein the state comprises at least one application selected from the group consisting of text, window title, parent and child windows, and control IDs.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4-17 and 20-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4-17 and 20-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1 and 17, respectively, are amended to clarify:

said application adapter further comprises a pre-login task in which a user ID corresponding to the user is configured as an external parameter and a pre-state for which is configured to recognize a prompt for the user ID and, responsive to the prompt for the user ID, to supply the user ID to the application via an application adapter runtime (see, e.g., Specification, pars. [0036]-[0039].

Support for the foregoing claim amendment is found throughout the specification and in the claims and no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4-12, 15-17, 20-22, and 25-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Saare (US Pub No 2005/0015772) in view of Omori (US Pub No 2002/0184405), and claims 13, 14, 23, and 24 stand rejected as being obvious over Saare in view of Omori and Pace (US Pub No 2003/0101223). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claims 1, 4-12, 15-17, 20-22, and 25-30, the proposed modification of Saare in view of Omori, the deficiencies of each of which have been pointed out in previous papers filed in this application, lacks one or more limitations recited in each of independent claims 1 and 17 in at least the following respects:

- Instead of obtaining an application adapter associated with the application, which application adapter specifies a sub-task, monitoring the application to obtain a state, and performing an action associated with the sub-task if the state is associated with the sub-task, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly in independent claim 17, Saare describes a web portal running on a server and proposes selecting a helper module to link a channel with a particular application depending on the type of device accessing the web server and to act as an adapter between the coding of the two (see, e.g., Saare, pars. [0002], [0051], and [0056]).
- Likewise, instead of authenticating a user, retrieving a single sign-on profile associated with the user if the user is authenticated, which single sign-on profile comprises the application adapter that specifies a sub-task and is associated with the application, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly in independent claim 17, Saare proposes a portal server storing a user's log-in credentials, privileges and associated server names to enable the portal server to redirect the user's browser, e.g., to e-mail or other web portal channels (see, e.g., Saare, pars. [0040] and [0059]).
- As admitted by the Examiner, Saare also fails to disclose monitoring the application to obtain a state and performing an action associated with the sub-task, if the state is associated with the sub-task, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly in independent claim 17. Omori fails to remedy the deficiencies of Saare. On the contrary, instead of monitoring the application to obtain a state and performing an action associated with the sub-task if the state is associated with the sub-task, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly in independent claim 17, Omori proposes providing recorded data representing an operation state of an application service provider to additional functions of the service provider, a back-end linkage that monitors, activates or stops processing for the service provider, and realizing the linkage by monitoring the process state of the service provider's applications (see, e.g., Omori, pars. [0022], [0124], and [0133]).
- Further, there is no hint of teaching or suggestion in either Saare or Omori that said application adapter further comprises a pre-login task in which a user ID

corresponding to the user is configured as an external parameter and a pre-state for which is configured to recognize a prompt for the user ID and, responsive to the prompt for the user ID, to supply the user ID to the application via an application adapter runtime, as recited in amended claims 1 and 17. On the contrary, while it is true that Saare includes so-called application helper modules, the sole function of Saare's helper modules is to convert data into a common format between applications. Thus, according to Saare, "In embodiments of the present invention, the application helper modules adapt the existing web applications and services so that their content is displayed in a usable manner on the user's mobile device." (Saare, par. [0055]). While it is also true that Omori discusses various "service adapters", it is likewise true that the Omori discloses nothing more than converting data into a common format between applications similarly to Saare. Still further, the single sign-on mode mentioned briefly in Saare utilizes an identity module storing persistent user ID data (Saare, par. [0040]) identical to the existing art master token-based single sign-on tool described in the Background section of the present Application (Specification, pars. [0002]-[0003]). Moreover, the single sign-on environment mentioned briefly in Omori consists of a server storing operation log information in a database and outputting the information by the server to an additional service function (see, e.g., Omori, pars. [0091]-[0093]) and is likewise no different than the existing art master token-based single sign-on tool described in the Background section of the present Application.

Consequently, Saare and/or Omori, separately or in combination with one another, do not recite the required combination of limitations of amended independent claims 1 and/or 17. Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach the limitations of independent claims 1 and/or 17, the Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of unpatentability. In *re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A., 1974) (holding that a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires the references to teach all of the limitations of the rejected claim); See also MPEP §2143.03. The Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie*

case of unpatentability for independent claims 1 and/or 17 and similarly has failed to establish a *prima case* of unpatentability for claims 4-12, 15-16 that depend on claim 1 and claims 20-22, and 25-30 that depend on claim 17, and which recite further specific elements that have no reasonable correspondence with the references.

Regarding claims 13, 14, 23 and 24, the proposed modification of Saare in view of Omori and Pace lacks one or more limitations recited in each of claims 13 and 14 depending on independent claim 1 and claims 23 and 24 depending on independent claim 17 in at least the following respects:

- For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 17, Saare and Omori do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to any of claims 13, 14, 23, or 24, because Saare and/or Omori do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1 on which claims 13 and 14 depend or of independent claim 17 on which claims 23 and 24 depend. Since claims 13 and 14 are dependent on allowable independent claim 1 and claims 23 and 24 are dependent on allowable independent claim 17, and since Pace, which merely discloses use of the term “dynamic link library”, does not cure the deficiencies of Saare and/or Omori, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima case* of unpatentability for claims 13 or 14 that depend on claim 1 or claims 23 or 24 that depend on claim 17, and which recite further specific elements that have no reasonable correspondence with the references.

Consequently, Saare and/or Omori and/or Pace, separately or in combination with one another, do not recite the required combination of limitations of claims 13 or 14 that depend on claim 1 or claims 23 or 24 that depend on claim 17. Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach the limitations of claims 13 or 14 that depend on claim 1 or claims 23 or 24 that depend on claim 17, the Examiner has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of unpatentability. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A., 1974) (holding that a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires the references to teach all of the limitations of the rejected claim); See also MPEP §2143.03.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and these remarks/arguments, each of the claims remaining in the application is in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection and to pass the application to issue. Should the Office feel that contacting the undersigned representative will aid in expediting the prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to do so at the number provided below. If any fees are required in connection with this filing, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4402.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 12, 2008

By: /John M. Harrington, Reg. #25,592/
John M. Harrington
(Reg. No. 25,592)

KING & SPALDING LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 737-0500